

From: Issa Ajlouny [REDACTED]
To: <Smunro@energy.state.ca.us>
Date: 3/2/2005 5:35:20 PM
Subject: MEC comments on the Air emissions Amendment

Steve, as you know I have great concern on this amendment that Calpine is trying to have passed. This amendment has changed the entire emissions numbers in startup conditions and I really feel strong that there should be a hearing for this kind of major change. I have listed some of the reasons why we need a hearing and other concerns below

1. In data request 17 from the CEC it stated:
Data Request 17

In the work shop you held in San Jose a couple of weeks ago it was stated that the ambient air numbers used in the modeling was different then what was used in the Commission Decision. As you can see the applicant is recklessly coming out with numbers to used to what ever suits them best. If the original ambient air numbers were used then the modeling emissions would be higher the what was given to us from the applicant in the work shop. This point needs to be addressed and not ignored like it was in the work shop.

2. Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) in the original decision was set to .2 grains per 100 scf. With this change the BAAQMD has changed it to 1.0 grains per 100 scf and is not consistent with the CEC decision. This point also needs to be addressed and not ignored like it was in the work shop.

3. I feel because of all the misinformation on air emissions on MEC it would be in the great interest to the community that some source testing to be done to verify the calculation numbers used.

4. BAAQMD said in the work shop they were going to use the original ambient air numbers from the Commission Decision and yet the CEC staff has refused.

5. The last point I would like to bring to the Commission is it makes me real curious on how Joe Loyer was aggressive in getting to the bottom of the amendment and how it was calculated and just when he sends out a number of data request that the applicant did not want to answer then Joe was pulled off MEC. Assigning a consultant who has a great interest in pleasing who hired them makes it real easy for this amendment not to get the close attention it deserves. You need to remember that MEC is in a neighborhood and just because licensed it does mean the CEC should be careless and disregard our concerns as it appeared in the work shop for this.

If you need any clarification on this please let me know.

Thanks,
Issa Ajlouny
168 Sprucemont Place
San Jose, CA. 95139

CC: <pao@energy.state.ca.us>, <dockets@energy.state.ca.us>